

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7329**

---

TYRONE LAMAR ROBERSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ANTHONY J. PADULA, Warden Lee Corrections Institution;  
LIEUTENANT A. DAVIS; MS. FULTON, Medical Health Care  
Provider RN; RN MS. JUDY RABON; RN MS. MCDONALD; J. MCREE,  
MD, KCI Pharmacy; JUANITA MOSS, Food Service Supervisor;  
MS. BELL, Food Service Supervisor; MS. NORMAN, Food Service  
Supervisor; MS. ANDERSON, Food Service Supervisor,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; MAJOR JAMES DEAN;  
LIEUTENANT ERNEST MIMS; SERGEANT B. COOK; SERGEANT K.  
ARENS; MS. KELA E. THOMAS, Commission of Probation Parole  
and Pardon Services Director; WILLIAM BYARS, JR., SCDC  
Director, et al; SOUTH CAROLINA STATE BUDGET AND CONTROL  
BOARD COMMITTEE; WILLIAM F. MARSCHER, III, SC Commission on  
Indigent Defense; FREDERICK M. CORLEY, Esquire; RANDOLPH  
MURDAUGH, III, Solicitor Attorney for the State; WILLIAM T.  
HOWELL, Judge of the 14th Judicial Circuit Court of SC,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District  
Judge. (2:13-cv-01872-RMG)

---

Submitted: March 29, 2016

---

Decided: March 31, 2016

Before GREGORY and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Tyrone Lamar Roberson, Appellant Pro Se. Joseph Parker McLean,  
CLARKE, JOHNSON, PETERSON & MCLEAN, PA, Florence, South  
Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tyrone Lamar Roberson appeals the district court's order adopting the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Roberson v. Padula, No. 2:13-cv-01872-RMG (D.S.C. July 22, 2015). In addition, we decline to address claims raised for the first time on appeal. See Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED